

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-67 were presented for examination and were pending in this application. In an Office Action dated October 4, 2007, claims 1-67 were rejected.

Applicants thank the Examiner for examination of the claims pending in this application and address the Examiner's comments below. Based on the above following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections and withdraw them.

### **Response to Rejections Under 35 USC 103(a)**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-2, 4, 6, 12, 14, 29-32, 38, 40, 50-51, 58, 60 and 67 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,633,723 to Sugiyama ("Sugiyama") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,611,622 to Krumm ("Krumm") and U. S. Patent No. 5,721,883 to Katsuo ("Katsuo"). This rejection is traversed.

The independent claims, recite, in part, the following:

Claim 1: "a media processing system ... configured to recognize content contained within the time-based media and *determine a printed representation of the time-based media based on the recognized content* ... the media processing system resides at least in part on the printing system"

Claim 31: "wherein the computing device and the printing device are configured to perform media processing in cooperation to recognize content contained within the time-based media and to *produce the printed representation based on the recognized content*... wherein the media processing is performed at least partially by the printing system"

Claim 50: "the processing performed at least in part within a printing system ... wherein the processing comprises recognizing content contained within the time-based media and *producing the printed representation based on the recognized content*"

The claimed systems and method allows for receiving time-based media, recognizing content contained within the media and *determining a printed representation of the time-based*

*media based on the recognized content.* The content recognition discussed in the present application may include video event detection, video foreground/background segmentation, face detection, face image matching, face recognition, face cataloging, video text localization, video optical character recognition (OCR), language translation, frame classification, clip classification, image stitching, audio reformatting, speech recognition, audio event detection, audio waveform matching, caption alignment, audio-caption alignment, and any other type of media content recognition algorithms. A printed representation, such as a musical score, is determined based on the recognized content, such as an audio event.

The Examiner alleges that Sugiyama discloses a “media processing system configured to capture content contained within the time-based media and *determine a printed representation of the time-based media based on the recognized content.*” However, Sugiyama merely describes converting chrominance and luminance data into image data and printing the image data. *See* Sugiyama, col. 3, lines 36-42. This merely describes determining a printed representation of received data, not determining the printed representation of time-based media based on recognized content.

Additionally, the Examiner has stated that Sugiyama “does not disclose expressly recognizing content contained within the time-based media.” Therefore, since Sugiyama does not disclose recognizing content contained within the time-based media, Sugiyama cannot disclose *determining a printed representation of the time-based media based on the recognized content.*

Krumm fails to remedy the deficiencies of Sugiyama. Krumm merely describes an object recognition technique that identifies people or objects of interest in a scene. *See* Krumm, col. 8, lines 28-33. Krumm in no way describes determining a printed representation of time-based

media based on recognized content, as claimed in the present application. Further, would not be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the content recognition technique of Krumm to determine a printed representation of time-based media based on recognized content.

Furthermore, Katsuo also fails to remedy the deficiencies of Sugiyama and Krumm. Katsuo merely describes a system for performing parallel processing of images. *See* Katsuo, abstract. Katsuo in no way describes determining a printed representation of time-based media based on recognized content, as claimed in the present application.

Further, the claimed systems and method allows for media processing that is distributed between the printer and one or more network devices. The claimed media processing is performed on the content of the time-based media; the processing is more than mere shared processing of an image. Therefore, the claims do recite the processing of actual content of the media (beyond mere sharing of image processing) that is performed at least partially by the print system. The processing, as claimed, uses content recognition on the time-based media to produce the printed representation based on the recognized content.

The Examiner alleges that Katsuo remedies the deficiency in Sugiyama in that Katsuo discloses “performing parallel processing of image data, and thus processing image data at least in part on one system and at least in part on a second system.” Katsuo merely discloses an image processing unit with an arithmetic section having a plurality of arithmetic processors. The plurality of arithmetic processors of the arithmetic section shares the image processing, for example, by dividing a single picture into small sections to carry out the processing. *See* Katsuo, col. 4, lines 11-15. However, the media processing system of the present invention resides, at least in part, on the printing system a printing system and, at least in part, on the network device. The processing, as claimed, uses content recognition on the time-based media to produce the

printed representation based on the recognized content. As discussed above, the claimed media processing is performed on the content of the time-based media; the processing is more sharing of image processing. Therefore, the claims do recite the processing of actual content of the media (beyond mere sharing of image processing) that is performed at least partially by the print system.

Therefore, based on the above remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that for at least these reasons, independent claims 1, 31 and 50 are patently distinguishable over the cited references, both alone and in combination. Additionally, since claims 2, 4, 6, 12, 14, 29, 30, 32, 38, 40, 51, 58, 60 and 67 dependent directly or indirectly from claims 1, 31 or 50, all arguments advanced above with respect to independent claims 1, 31 and 50 are hereby incorporated so as to apply to dependent claims 2, 4, 6, 12, 14, 29, 30, 32, 38, 40, 51, 58, 60 and 67 as well.

The Examiner rejects claims 3, 5 and 33 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sugiyama in view of Krumm, Katsuo and U.S. Patent No. 6,167,033 to Chang (“Chang”) and rejects claims 7-8, 15, 23, 34, 41, 49, 52-54 and 61 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sugiyama in view of Krumm, Katsuo and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0220988 to Hymel (“Hymel”). Chang merely describes transmitting digital packets over a local area network. *See* Chang, abstract. Chang in no way describes in no way describes determining a printed representation of time-based media based on recognized content, as claimed in the present application. Hymel merely describes providing video signal data at an interface using a removable storage reader. *See* Hymel, abstract. Hymel in no way describes in no way describes determining a printed representation of time-based media based on recognized content, as claimed in the present application.

The Examiner also rejects claims 9, 25-26, 35 and 55 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sugiyama in view of Krumm, Katsuo and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0010641 to Stevens (“Stevens”) and rejects claims 10, 36 and 56 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sugiyama in view of Krumm, Katsuo, Stevens, Hymel and U.S. Patent No. 6,296,693 to McCarthy (“McCarthy”). Stevens merely describes portable receiving system for receiving data products and data product information. See Stevens, abstract. Stevens in no way describes determining a printed representation of time-based media based on recognized content, as claimed in the present application.

The Examiner further rejects claims 11, 37 and 57 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sugiyama in view of Krumm, Katsuo and U.S. Patent No. 5,170,935 to Federspiel (“Federspiel”), U.S. Patent No. 5,940,776 to Baron (“Baron”) and McCarthy and rejects claims 13, 27-28, 39 and 59 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sugiyama in view of Krumm, Katsuo and U.S. Patent No. U.S. Patent No. 6,118,888 to Chino (“Chino”). Federspiel merely describes A system for providing adaptable control of an HVAC system which regulates environmental conditions within an enclosed area. *See* Federspiel, abstract. Federspiel in no way describes determining a printed representation of time-based media based on recognized content, as claimed in the present application. Baron merely describes an embedded weather service radio alert receiver. See Baron, abstract. Baron in no way describes determining a printed representation of time-based media based on recognized content, as claimed in the present application. McCarthy merely describes a capacitive sensor for measuring a characteristic of a fluid or a filling depth of a liquid in a container. See McCarthy, abstract. McCarthy in no way

describes in no way describes determining a printed representation of time-based media based on recognized content, as claimed in the present application. Chino merely describes a multi-modal interface apparatus and a method to smoothly communicate between the user and the apparatus. See Chino, abstract. Chino in no way describes in no way describes determining a printed representation of time-based media based on recognized content, as claimed in the present application.

The Examiner rejects claims 16, 21-22, 24, 42, 47-48, 62 and 66 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sugiyama in view of Krumm, Katsuo and U.S. Patent No. 6,308,887 (“Korman”) and rejects claims 17, 43 and 63 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sugiyama in view of Krumm, Katsuo, Horman, Hymel, U.S. Patent No. 5,936,542 to Kleinrock (“Kleinrock”) and U.S. Patent No. 5,568,406 to Gerber (“Gerber”). Korman merely describes an automated transaction machine network which supports multiple-destination transactions. See Korman, abstract. Korman in no way describes in no way describes determining a printed representation of time-based media based on recognized content, as claimed in the present application. Kleinrock merely describes a convention ID badge system which provides a trade-show badging system for two-way data exchange. See Kleinrock , abstract. Kleinrock in no way describes in no way describes determining a printed representation of time-based media based on recognized content, as claimed in the present application. Gerber merely describes a method and system to detect and identify a target vehicle displaying a switched or invalid license plate. See Gerber, abstract. Gerber in no way describes in no way describes determining a printed representation of time-based media based on recognized content, as claimed in the present application.

The Examiner also rejects claims 18 and 44 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sugiyama in view of Krumm, Katsuo and U.S. Patent No. 5,270,989 to Kimura (“Kimura”) and rejects claims 19 and 45 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sugiyama in view of Krumm, Katsuo, Kimura, and U.S. Patent No. 5,136,563 to Takemasa (“Takemasa”) and U.S. Patent No. 4,734,898 to Morinaga (“Morinaga”). Kimura merely describes a disk player capable of playing one of a plurality of disks arranged on a tray. *See* Kimura, abstract. Kimura in no way describes in no way describes determining a printed representation of time-based media based on recognized content, as claimed in the present application. Takemasa merely describes a magazine holder of a compact disc player. *See* Takemasa, abstract. Takemasa in no way describes in no way describes determining a printed representation of time-based media based on recognized content, as claimed in the present application.

The further Examiner rejects claims 20, 46 and 64-65 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sugiyama in view of Krumm, Katsuo and U.S. Patent No. 6,000,030 to Steinberg (“Steinberg”). Steinberg merely describes a method and apparatus for controlling the distribution of computer software products stored at a file server. *See* Steinberg, abstract. Steinberg in no way describes in no way describes determining a printed representation of time-based media based on recognized content, as claimed in the present application.

Because claims 3, 5, 8-11, 13, 15-18, 33-37, 39, 41-49, 52-57, 59 and 61-66 dependent directly or indirectly from claims 1, 31 or 50, all arguments advanced above with respect to independent claims 1, 31 and 50 are hereby incorporated so as to apply to dependent claims 3, 5, 8-11, 13, 15-18, 33-37, 39, 41-49, 52-57, 59 and 61-66 as well.

### Conclusion

In sum, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-67, as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over the cited references (including references cited, but not applied). Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration of the basis for the rejections to these claims and request allowance of them.

In addition, Applicants respectfully invite Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below if Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

PETER E. HART, JONATHAN J. HULL, JAMEY  
GRAHAM, AND KURT PERSOL

Dated: February 4, 2008

By: /Kanda Ishihara/

Kanda Ishihara, Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 56,607  
FENWICK & WEST LLP  
801 California Street  
Mountain View, CA 94041  
Phone: (650) 335-7805  
Fax: (650) 938-5200  
Email: kishihara@fenwick.com